



**MINUTES**  
**OAK BAY ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL**  
**TUESDAY, JULY 5, 2016 AT 8:45 AM**  
**COUNCIL CHAMBERS, MUNICIPAL HALL, 2167 OAK BAY AVENUE**

---

**MEMBERS PRESENT**

Lynn Gordon-Finlay, Chair  
John Armitage  
James Kerr

Andrea Nemeth  
David Wilkinson

**MEMBERS ABSENT**

Councillor Tom Croft

**STAFF PRESENT**

Deborah Jensen, Planner

Krista Mitchell, Building/Planning Clerk

**1. Call to Order**

The meeting was called to order at 8:47 am.

**2. Adoption of Minutes from June 7, 2016**

It was moved and seconded that the Minutes from June 7, 2016 be adopted.

The motion was carried.  
None opposed.

**3. Approval of Agenda and Late Items**

The agenda was approved as presented.

**4. Information Items**

- a) Correspondence from E. and M. Bentzon
- b) Correspondence from N. Wale

Panel members noted that the Panel is a group of volunteers who advise Council on applications, and that correspondence should be addressed to Council,

A Panel member commented that the content of the correspondence was a good reminder of the principles and goals to be considered for the Uplands area.

D. Jensen stated the Advisory Design Panel meetings are public meetings and open to the community to observe Panel discussion.

It was moved and seconded to receive the correspondence.

## 5. Old Business

- a. ADP00049 – 3280 Weald Road – Uplands Siting and Design  
To permit construction of a single family home.

M. Whitney, applicant, presented the revised proposal. Some of the comments were:

- Floor plan redesigned resulting in a 614 ft<sup>2</sup> reduction to gross floor area.
- Eliminated rock wall and metal railing at the front lot line, but front yard retaining wall kept due to the slope from back to front.
- Driveway width reduced by five (5) feet.
- Gables eliminated and hip roof added to front elevation, reducing scale of the house.
- Roof vents and bell roof added to enhance traditional style of the home.
- Lower band added to bottom of house.

### ***Panel Comments***

Panel members requested clarification on the reduction in gross floor area, exterior material finishes, and tree removal, noting that even with the reduction in size the building still retains its 'boxy' nature.

M. Whitney responded that floor area has been reduced in response to neighbour concerns regarding massing, and that exterior finishes will consist of a medium acrylic finish on the walls, a fine limestone finish on the trim, with the material a cement coat with acrylic finish. The windows and flashing will be white, the roof flashing will be black, and the stone retaining wall will be natural stone with a concrete cap.

M. Whitney also noted the oak tree has root disease as per the arborist report, and the owner has advised the tree will be replaced, but not necessarily with an oak tree.

D. Jensen stated that removal of the tree due to health issues has been confirmed through both the municipal arborist report and the applicant's arborist report.

Panel members commented that there is a design challenge with this house at a two storey height when neighbouring houses are at 1 ½ storeys, and that the roof needs to be broken up but dormers create a feature and bring the eye to the roof line. The Panel determined that the design is appropriate for the site and landscaping will help.

Panel members inquired about exterior lighting, discussed dark sky principles, and commented that the driveway should be a 12 foot width to allow for tree plantings and to reflect other driveways.

M. Whitney stated the pot lights will be used for the two entrance doors on the north elevation, two sconces will be installed on the garage walls, and patio lighting will be used for the south elevation, noting the owners wish to have downcast lighting primarily for safety reasons.

The Panel members commented that the retaining wall should be removed, using subtle or natural terracing to bring the grade up. The house should have a stone base with a concrete cap.

In summary, the Panel members noted the following:

- Reduce driveway width and increase landscaping to the north of the driveway.
- Remove the dormers and the retaining wall from around the house.
- Respect dark sky principles.
- Use stone base around the house and front entrance columns.

### Advisory Design Panel Assessment Checklist

#### Siting of Buildings

1. Maintenance of residential park setting	Yes with increase to north planting strip by narrowing driveway and sloping up to the base of house rather than retaining wall.
2. Setbacks	Conforming
3. Relationship of character / massing to image of the area	A change in streetscape but comparable with Uplands as a whole.
4. Impact on scale and rhythm of development	A change, but appropriate to Uplands
5. Relationship to adjacent buildings	Within zoning requirements.
6. Effect of shadow on neighbouring properties	Minimal
7. Overlook and privacy issues	Some concerns from neighbours but is conforming.
8. Transition between private and public space	Removal of hedge in front is improvement. Changes suggested to improve transition.
9. Accessory buildings	N/A

#### Design of Buildings

1. General massing, proportion and overall articulation of building in relation to established housing	A change, see Siting.
2. Roofscape (eg./Soffits, Fascias, Flashing)	Good improvement to roofline with bell, roof and hip gables.
3. Flashing	To match adjacent material.
4. Lighting	To conform to dark sky principles.
5. Garages and Outbuildings	Garage part of house.

#### Landscaping

1. Fencing and screening	None - Landscape only
2. Preservation of significant healthy trees and plant material	Good
3. Native Plants, New Trees and Vegetation	Detailed landscape plan not submitted
4. Play and recreation areas	Appropriate
5. Hard landscaping	Driveway width to be reduced
6. Parking and driveways	See above

It was moved and seconded to recommend that Council approve ADP00049.

The motion was carried.  
None opposed.

## 6. New Business

- a. ADP00047 – 3140 Beach Drive – Uplands Siting and Design  
To permit construction of a single family home.

J. Grieve, applicant, gave a presentation of the proposal. Some of the comments were:

- Proposing a traditional two storey house with an attached garage / coach house and a small greenhouse located at the northwest corner of the property.
- Large Georgian influenced Palladian windows in gables.
- Two trees will be removed, with mature replacement trees planted in a group at the front of the property.
- Includes sunken pool, terrace, fruit trees and raised stone planters in the rear yard.

### ***Panel Comments***

Panel members inquired about exterior lighting, exterior windows and stone façade, suggesting stone be terminated at an inside corner, not the outside corner.

J. Grieve responded that lighting would be limited, with very few pot lights and walkways with small pyramidal stanchions with all lights casting down. He advised the stone façade will consist of K2 stone cut in 2.5" to 3" thickness and cut into corner pieces for the return.

J. Grieve also noted gothic windows will be oak and aluminum and the palladium windows perimeter trim will be a custom cast concrete product. There are no windows on the turret on the north elevations.

Panel members recommended moving the central gable up for more dominance, or removing the middle gable and siting a large railway station window in the middle.

D. Jensen advised the applicant that a tree protection plan was still required.

It was moved and seconded to recommend that ADP00047 be tabled to a subsequent meeting of the Advisory Design Panel.

The motion was carried.  
None opposed.

- b. ADP00052 – 3290 Norfolk Road – Uplands Siting and Design  
To permit construction of a single family home.

*This application proposes modifications to a single family home previously approved by the Advisory Design Panel.*

A. Mavrikos, applicant, presented the revised proposal. Some of the comments were:

- Proposing to reduce height of two second storey windows, remove one window from north elevation and one window from garage.
- Change cast stone moulding to EFIS stucco mouldings, and use asphalt slate on roof.
- Remove transom windows from French doors, increase height to 10 feet for two sets.

- Add additional steps to front stairs, and add two planters in front to hide exposed foundation and decrease amount of finished grade in front yard.
- Add two lamp posts at driveway entrance and move fence six feet to widen driveway.

### **Panel Comments**

Panel members were generally supportive of the proposed application, noting:

- Reducing height of second storey windows is supportable.
- Door heights along the rear of the house should be consistent, no variation in height between the sets of doors.
- Move the lamp standards to the foot of the front stairs, but do not include lights.
- Do not construct planters at front of house; use landscaping.
- Move the fence back 6 feet.
- Change in roofing material is okay.

### **Advisory Design Panel Assessment Checklist**

#### **Siting of Buildings**

1. Maintenance of residential park setting	Yes
2. Setbacks	Conforming
3. Relationship of character / massing to image of the area	No change from previous
4. Impact on scale and rhythm of development	No change
5. Relationship to adjacent buildings	No change
6. Effect of shadow on neighbouring properties	No change
7. Overlook and privacy issues	Some removal of windows
8. Transition between private and public space	Improved with suggested modifications.
9. Accessory buildings	N/A

#### **Design of Buildings**

1. General massing, proportion and overall articulation of building in relation to established housing	No change
2. Roofscape (eg./Soffits, Fascias, Flashing)	Change to slate profile asphalt shingles supported.
3. Flashing	No change
4. Lighting	Lights removed from posts
5. Garages and Outbuildings	No change

#### **Landscaping**

1. Fencing and screening	Fencing relocation is supported
2. Preservation of significant healthy trees and plant material	No change
3. Native Plants, New Trees and Vegetation	No change
4. Play and recreation areas	No change
5. Hard landscaping	Retaining wall proposed to be removed.
6. Parking and driveways	Driveway posts moved to anchor front steps.

It was moved and seconded to recommend that Council approve ADP00052.

The motion was carried.  
None opposed.

- c. DVP00044 / ADP00050 – 2985 Rutland Road – Uplands Siting and Design  
To permit an addition to a single family home.  
*Variances are requested.*

W. Peerboom, applicant, presented the project. Some of the comments were:

- Renovating an existing house, including replacing existing garage with a new second storey addition above a new garage. Variances are required.
- Exterior finishes will be stone veneer, stained shingle hardi panel siding, and a metal roof to provide for a west coast beach style.
- Landscaping remains the same, but proposing to remove large pine tree in rear yard.
- Adding new front porch and stairs.

### ***Panel Comments***

Panel members commented there is a problematic mix of styles that is not cohesive and elements are fighting each other, for example horizontal versus vertical. Comments were also made that real shingles should be used instead of hardi shingles, that there are too many gables, stone pillars are too spindly, and detailing is unresolved and portions of the glazing are confusing.

Panel members inquired about the health of the pine tree proposed to be removed and suggested the tree be retained.

D. Jensen noted the arborist report submitted with the application does not indicate the tree is in poor health and the Municipal arborist advises the tree is healthy. It was also noted the proposed construction would have an impact on the large pine tree, and additional information from the applicant's arborist has been requested.

W. Peerboom explained the owners want to remove the tree for maintenance issues and loss of sunlight.

Panel members commented that the variance was supportable but the large pine tree should remain.

It was moved and seconded to recommend that DVP00044 / ADP00050 be tabled to a subsequent meeting of the Advisory Design Panel.

The motion was carried.  
None opposed.

- d. DVP00048 - 1705 Monteith Street - Subdivision  
To permit construction of a single family home.  
*Variances are requested.*

B. Patterson, applicant, presented the application. Some of the comments were:

- Newly created lot that was subdivided off 2414 San Carlos, and that doesn't relate to other properties on the street.
- Triangular shaped lot is challenging to fit a three bedroom home and meet setback requirements, but worked with neighbours to maximize siting and retain privacy.

- Strata to south not affected due to fence and hedge, and driveway and window orientation designed to not impact other neighbouring property.
- Design theme is contemporary with mid to late 19<sup>th</sup> century details, and incorporates painted sand flow finish stucco, wood siding, black windows, and a low pitched roof.
- The two variance requests are for building height and front yard setback as the house was moved forward to allow for a larger rear yard.

### **Panel Comments**

Panel members commented that clerestory glazing could be utilized between the roof lines, and that deck siding should be extended around the corner to flatten the wall and provide horizontal screening. The Panel also commented that the southwest corner of the building looks ‘clipped’ and the applicant should realign that corner.

Panel members acknowledged this is a challenging site, that the applicant has been respectful of the adjacent neighbours, and variances are supportable.

### **Advisory Design Panel Assessment Checklist**

#### **Siting of Buildings**

1. Maintenance of residential park setting	Careful consideration of siting.
2. Setbacks	Front setback and height variances supported for the style of house.
3. Relationship of character / massing to image of the area	Compact family house appropriate.
4. Impact on scale and rhythm of development	Compact consideration of impact on neighbours.
5. Relationship to adjacent buildings	See 4
6. Effect of shadow on neighbouring properties	See 4
7. Overlook and privacy issues	See 4
8. Transition between private and public space	Well handled
9. Accessory buildings	N / A

#### **Design of Buildings**

1. General massing, proportion and overall articulation of building in relation to established housing	Appropriate
2. Roofscape (eg/Soffits, Fascias, Flashing)	Different style for area but nicely handled.
3. Flashing	Suitable
4. Lighting	-
5. Garages and Outbuildings	N/A

#### **Landscaping**

1. Fencing and screening	N/A
2. Preservation of Significant Healthy Trees and Plant Material	N/A
3. Native Plants, New Trees, and Vegetation	Not discussed
4. Play and recreation areas	Appropriate
5. Hard landscaping	Well handled
6. Parking and driveways	Attractive and contemporary

It was moved and seconded to recommend that Council approve DVP00048.

The motion was carried.  
J. Armitage opposed.

- e. DP0000014 – 2200 Oak Bay Avenue – Siting and Design  
To permit renovations at Pharmasave.

K. Koshman, applicant, presented the proposal. Some of the comments were:

- Proposing to modernize the exterior façade of the leased building by flattening the existing façade, removing the inset bay doors and replacing with modern automatic sliding doors, using wood soffits and installing metal trim windows.
- Existing red awning to be replaced with a black canvas angled awning.
- Stucco will be painted white and bottom of wall to be wood siding in dark walnut colour.
- Signage size may need to be reduced, but font, colour and layout will remain the same.
- Proposing pot lights in soffits, and signs will be backlit.

### ***Panel Comments***

Panel members inquired about the sliding doors, and commented detailing around existing pilasters near entrance to the adjacent bank should be reconsidered.

K. Koshman advised the recessed doors will be modified to be flush to the windows and will not swing out over the property line. There would be a break away door in case of emergency.

Panel members noted that a clear stain would be a better choice than a black walnut colour, that a black awning is not preferable, and suggested the colour scheme be reconsidered to make the building more welcoming. Suggestions were also made to look at adjacent buildings and how they may complement each other, and to break up the awning to reduce its mass.

It was moved and seconded to recommend that DP00014 be tabled to a subsequent meeting of the Advisory Design Panel.

The motion was carried.

None opposed.

## **7. Next Meeting**

The next regular meeting of the Advisory Design Panel is Tuesday, September 6, 2016.

## **8. Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 12:33 pm.